

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13-18, 20-22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. (U.S. 6,486,895) and Mackinlay (U.S. 6,088,032).

Claims 5, 9, 12, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al. (U.S. 6,486,895), Mackinlay (U.S. 6,088,032), and Gounares et al. (U.S. 6,681,370).

Entry of the proposed amendments of the After Final Amendment of August 21, 2006 concerning the dependent claims and reconsideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Further, the following remarks are respectfully submitted in response to the Advisory Action response to arguments concerning the independent claims.

Thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1-26 are pending.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

Claims 1, 15, 25 and 26 are independent, which are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson (US Patent No. 6,486,895) in view of Mackinlay (US Patent No. 6,088,032).

Regarding the independent claims, the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet asserts that the After Final Amendment arguments have not been persuasive, because Mackinlay allegedly reads on the language of the claims given their broadest reasonable interpretation. In particular, the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet alleges Mackinlay's "linked documents are displayed at certain coordinate in reference to a viewed document (see, col. 11, lines 19-30)," which allegedly reads on the claim language "generate the respective pieces of intermediate data for displaying a particular linked content item of the information object, according to a geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object." The Examiner also alleges that Mackinlay can meet this claim language, because in Mackinlay "the

linked documents are displayed in specific order based on the various level of their linked contents (see, fig. 15 and 16; depth 1510 and 1511)."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Mackinlay, because Mackinlay's column 11, lines 19-30 discuss "creation of piles with the angle from the center chosen randomly is illustrated in FIGS. 10-12." Mackinlay discusses displaying a document pile representation by placing a document on top of another document using coordinates (ϕ , x) (an angle ϕ and a radius x), so that other documents do not become blocked from view when displayed (column 11, lines 31-40). However, Mackinlay's document pile representation differs from the claim language "generate the respective pieces of intermediate data for displaying a particular linked content item of the information object, according to a geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object," because Mackinlay's document pile representation is only based upon display coordinates of (ϕ , x) for a document (see Mackinlay FIGS. 10-12) and Mackinlay uses the radius x constant to offset another display coordinates of another document, which does not involve any type of a geometric relation between a visual field and a linked content of the document. In other words, Mackinlay's document pile representation is not based upon "a geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object," because Mackinlay column 11, lines 21-40 is silent on using the claimed "linked content" for controlling displaying of the document pile representation. Mackinlay only uses a display coordinate to display the document pile without regard to the claimed "a geometric relation between **a visual field and linked content item** of the information object."

Further, the Examiner relies on Mackinlay column 12, lines 56-61, which discuss the FIG. 15 cone tree 1501 and the various levels of the walk. Mackinlay's cone tree 1501 shows two levels 1510 and 1511 and "level 1511 is the results of a walk along the links contained in linked page 1514." However, Mackinlay column 12, lines 20-62 discuss selecting a starting page 1509 and displaying a cone tree representation 1510, 1511 of linked pages in the starting page 1509 as 'walking' to another level of linked pages, which differs from the language of the claims "a geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object," since Mackinlay navigates the linked pages using a cone tree. In contrast to a Mackinlay's cone tree, the claimed invention uses "a geometric relation between **a visual field and linked content item** of the information object." In other words, Mackinlay is silent on using

the claimed "visual field" to control displaying other linked pages of a document page, because Mackinlay only uses a document page selection to create the cone tree of linked pages. The claimed "***geometric relation between a visual field and linked content item***" clearly differs from Mackinlay's 'cone tree.'

In view of the remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13

Dependent claims 8, 10, 11, 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson and Mackinlay. Dependent claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, Mackinlay and Gounares (US Patent No. 6,681,730).

Regarding the dependent claims 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13, the Advisory Action Continuation Sheet provided that the proposed amendments have not been entered since they raise new issues. Therefore, entry and consideration of these claims as amended is respectfully requested.

A combined system of Robertson, Mackinlay and Gounares fails to disclose or suggest to one skilled in the art the language of dependent claims 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13. Regarding "assigning a display priority to each ... linked content item of an information object," the final Office Action, for example in rejecting claim 8, relies on Robertson's sequential page display. Dependent claims 8, 9, 11 and 13, using claim 8 as an example, are amended to clarify that the display priority of a particular linked content item of an information object changes based upon "***the geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object***" (dependent claim 8).

8. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) The information processing apparatus according to claim 1 further comprising:

means for assigning a display priority to each of a plurality of linked content items of an information object ***and changing the display priority of a particular linked content item of an information object based upon the geometric relation between said visual field and said particular linked content item of the information object***;

said first means comparing said display priority of a particular linked content item of an information object with a predetermined threshold to thereby determine whether to generate

a piece of intermediate data of said particular linked content item of the information object;

said second means comparing said display priority of said particular linked content item of the information object with a predetermined threshold to thereby determine whether to generate a display image of said particular linked content item of the information object.

For example, the present Application page 32, lines 1-12 support the claim amendments.

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 8, 9, 11 and 13 and allowance of dependent claims 8, 9, 11 and 13 is respectfully requested. Other dependent claims recite either patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.


CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 19, 2006

By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501